

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Advisory Action of March 12, 2003. This amendment is filed along with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR §1.114 and a Petition to Revive.

With this response, claims 1, 12 and 19 are amended and new claims 24 and 25 are added. All pending claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-25 are being presented for consideration and favorable action.

In the prior Office Actions, claim 19 was rejected based upon Baxter (US 5,881,454). The remaining claims were rejected based upon Baxter in view of Jabbori et al. (US 5,541,787).

With this response, independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended. These claims state that the electrical connector is secured to an edge of a printed circuit board assembly ("PCBA"). Further, the connector includes a plurality of pins which extend generally parallel with a plane of the PCBA. Further still, the guide pin extends generally perpendicular to the plurality of pins and generally perpendicular to the plane of the PCBA. This configuration is not shown or suggested by the Baxter or Jabbori et al. references.

As discussed in the specification, the present invention provides a technique for aligning an edge connector of a disc drive unit. Proper alignment can be particularly beneficial in configurations, for example, in which the drive is used in a "hot swappable" installation. Neither Baxter or Jabbori et al. address this issue.

The Baxter reference does not provide a locating feature in accordance with the invention. The pins of Baxter et al. are, apparently, simply soldered to a circuit board. Jabbori et al. show an internal connector in which the pins extend perpendicular to the circuit board and parallel. Further, pins 72 of Jabbori et al. extend parallel with the pins of the electrical connector.

First, Applicant notes that there is no suggestion to combine the two references. Jabbori et al. is related to an internal connection and a technique for use in automated

assembly. Baxter et al. simply shows a typical edge connector configuration. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, even if the two references were combined, the claimed configuration would not be achieved. For example, if the two references were combined, the resultant device might have a connector with pins along the edge which extend perpendicular to the circuit board. Alternatively, the electrical connector could include pins which extend parallel to a locating pin. Neither of these configurations is in accordance with independent claims 1 and 12. For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In fact, the two references illustrate the novelty and non-obvious nature of the present invention. Both applications are from the same Assignee. However, even though Baxter was filed six years after the original filing date of the Jabbori et al. reference, the Baxter reference makes no mention of such a configuration. In fact, the Baxter reference teaches away from any type of a "press fit" assembly. (Col. 1, line 50). For this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant further notes that the dependent claims, when read in the environment of the claims from which they depend, set forth numerous configurations which are not shown or suggested by the references. Additionally, new dependent claims 24 and 25 specifically set forth the bottom surface of the base plate comprises an outer surface. As discussed in the prior response, this configuration is also not shown.

Independent claim 19 is written in means-plus-function form. In accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6, such a claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalence thereof. The corresponding structure is described in the present application and includes the particular configuration of the pins and guide pin. This structure is not shown or suggested in the prior art. Further, Applicant expressly disclaims any equivalence of this structure which would render the claim unpatentable due to obviousness or a lack of novelty.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance.  
Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance.  
Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

16 March 2004  
Date

Jennifer M. Buenzow  
Jennifer M. Buenzow, Reg. No. 50,129  
Patent Attorney  
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC  
Intellectual Property Dept. - SHK2LG  
1280 Disc Drive  
Shakopee, MN 55379-1863  
(952) 402-3436 (telephone)  
(952) 402-2657 (facsimile)